

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,690	09/28/2001	Li-Lien Lee	146712002600	2930
25227 75	90 11/21/2002	•		
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP			EXAMINER	
1650 TYSONS MCLEAN, VA	BLVD SUITE 300 22102		RICKMAN, HOLLY C	
			. ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	<u> </u>
			DATE MAILED: 11/21/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		07				
	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summan	09/964,690	LEE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Holly Rickman	1773				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Thi	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
 Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.						
15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.						
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal F	r (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/964,690

Art Unit: 1773

.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in-
- (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
- (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Futamoto et al. (US 6383667).

Futamoto et al. disclose a magnetic recording medium having an adhesion reinforcing layer (corresponds to claimed seedlayer) deposited on a substrate to a thickness of 20 Å. The adhesion layer is an element selected from a group including Nb or an alloy thereof (col. 15, lines 55-64; col. 20, lines 6-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 1773

, <u>j</u>

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 10-11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Futamoto et al. (US 6383667).

Futamoto et al. teaches all of the limitations of the claims as set forth above except for the limitations directed to remanent coercivity. It is the Examiner's contention that the structure taught by Futamoto et al. inherently satisfies the claimed remanent coercivity limitations by virtue of the fact that the structure includes a Nb "seedlayer" having the claimed thickness. The specification states on page 8 that, "[t]he niobium-containing seedlayer of the invention has a positive effect on remanent coercivity and/or SMNR relative to recording medium without such a s seedlayer." Thus, it appears that it is the use of a Nb seedlayer that is used to optimize the Hr of the magnetic recording layer.

It has been held that where claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, the burden of proof is shifted to applicant to show that prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess characteristics of claimed products where the rejection is based on inherency under 35 USC §102 or on prima facie obviousness under 35 USC §103, jointly or alternatively. *In re Best, Bolton, and Shaw,* 195 USPQ 430. (CCPA 1977).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1-4, 7-9,11-15, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bian et al. (US 6174582) in view of Ohkubo et al. (US 5851628).

Art Unit: 1773

P

Bian et al. disclose a magnetic recording medium having a seedlayer formed from Nb and containing nitrogen. The reference teaches that the seedlayer is sputtered in an atmosphere containing N and may have a N concentration of 10-50 at % (col. 4, lines 57-60; col. 5, lines 22-49). Bian et al. teach that the thickness of the seedlayer is not believed to be critical and a range of 5-30 nm is given as guidance. Thus, the reference fails to disclose an embodiment of the invention having a seedlayer 1-40 Å in thickness.

Ohkubo et al. teaches that it is known in the art that the thickness of a seedlayer affects the coercivity of a magnetic recording medium (Fig. 18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine the optimal thickness of the Nb seedlayer taught by Bian et al. in order to obtain the desired coercivity. It has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Holly Rickman whose telephone number is (703) 305-2642. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Thibodeau can be reached on (703) 308-2367. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Holly Rickman Patent Examiner Art Unit 1773

hcr November 18, 2002